arXiv:1702.08087v1 [math.AP] 26 Feb 2017

A RIGOROUS DERIVATION FROM THE KINETIC CUCKER-SMALE MODEL TO THE PRESSURELESS EULER SYSTEM WITH NONLOCAL ALIGNMENT

ALESSIO FIGALLI AND MOON-JIN KANG

Abstract. We consider the kinetic Cucker-Smale model with local alignment as a mesoscopic description for the flocking dynamics. The local alignment was first proposed by Karper, Mellet and Trivisa [21], as a singular limit of a normalized non-symmetric alignment introduced by Motsch and Tadmor [24]. The existence of weak solutions to this model is obtained in [21]. The time-asymptotic flocking behavior is shown in this article. Our main contribution is to provide a rigorous derivation from mesoscopic to mascroscopic description for the Cucker-Smale flocking models. More precisely, we prove the hydrodynamic limit of the kinetic Cucker-Smale model with local alignment towards the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal alignment, under a regime of strong local alignment. Based on the relative entropy method, a main difficulty in our analysis comes from the fact that the entropy of the limit system has no strictly convexity in terms of density variable. To overcome this, we combine relative entropy quantities with the 2-Wasserstein distance.

1. Introduction

This article is mainly devoted to providing a rigorous justification on hydrodynamic limit of the kinetic Cucker-Smale model to the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal alignment force. In [6], Cucker and Smale introduced an agent-based model capturing flocking phenomenon observed within the complex systems such as a flock of birds, school of fish and swarm of insects. The Cucker-Smale (CS) model has received a extensive attention in the mathematical community as well as the physics, biology, engineering and social science, etc. (See for instance [2, 5, 4, 8, 9, 12, 15, 17, 25, 30] and the refereces therein.) In [24], Motsch and Tadmor proposed a modified Cucker-Smale model by replacing the original CS alignment by a normalized non-symmetric alignment. In [21], Karper, Mellet, and Trivisa proposed a new kinetic flocking model as a combination of the CS alignment and a local alignment interaction, where the latter was obtained as a singular limit of the non-symmetric alignment introduced by Motsch and Tadmor.

Date: March 1, 2017.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.*

Key words and phrases. hydrodynamic limit, kinetic Cucker-Smale model, local alignment, pressureless Euler system, relative entropy, Wasserstein distance.

Acknowledgment. The work of A. Figalli is supported by the ERC Grant "Regularity and Stability in Partial Differential Equations (RSPDE)". The work of M.-J. Kang is supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (NRF-2013R1A6A3A03020506) .

In this article, we consider the kinetic flocking model without Brownian noise, proposed by Karper, Mellet and Trivisa in [20] on $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \nabla_v \cdot (L[f]f) + \nabla_v \cdot ((u-v)f) = 0, \\ &L[f](t,x,v) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x-y) f(t,y,w)(w-v)\, dw\, dy, \\ &u(t,x) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f dv}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f dv}, \quad \|f(0)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $\psi : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is a Lipschitz communication weight that is positive and symmetric, i.e., $\psi(x-y) = \psi(y-x)$. The term $\nabla_v \cdot (L[f]f)$ describes a nonlocal alignment due to the original Cucker-Smale flocking mechanism, while the last term $\nabla_v \cdot ((u-v)f)$ describes a local alignment interaction, because of the averaged local velocity u. The global existence of weak solutions to (1.1) has been proved in [20]. The flocking behaviors of (1.1), however, are not studied so far. We here provide its time-asymptotic behavior.

As a mesoscopic description, the kinetic model (1.1) is posed in $(t,x,v) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., in $2d+1$ dimensions. This feature provides a accurate description for a significant number of particles. However, its numerical test is very costly with respect to an associated macroscopic description. Hence, it is very important to find a suitable parameter regime on which the complexity of (1.1) is reduced.

The main goal of this article is to show a singular limit of (1.1) in a regime of strong local alignment:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot (L[f^\varepsilon]f^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_v \cdot ((u^\varepsilon - v) f^\varepsilon) = 0, \\ &L[f^\varepsilon](t,x,v) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)(w-v)\, dw\, dy, \\ &u^\varepsilon = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^\varepsilon dv}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon dv}, \\ &f^\varepsilon|_{t=0} = f_0^\varepsilon, \quad \|f_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

As $\varepsilon \to 0$, it is expected that the solution f^ε of (1.2) converges, in some weak sense, to a mono-kinetic distribution[1]

$$\delta_{v=u(t,x)} \otimes \rho(t,x). \tag{1.3}$$

[1]In this paper we will use the symbol $\otimes$ in two different contexts: if μ is a measure on a complete metric space X, and $\{\nu_x\}_{x \in X}$ is a family of measures on a complete metric space Y, then $\nu_x \otimes \mu$ denotes the measure on $X \times Y$ defined as

$$\int_{X \times Y} \varphi\, d[\nu_x \otimes \mu] = \int_X \left(\int_Y \varphi(x,y)\, d\nu_x(y) \right) d\mu(x) \qquad \forall \varphi \in C_c(X \times Y).$$

When ν_x is independent of x (that is, $\nu_x = \nu$ for all x), we use the more standard notation $\mu \otimes \nu$ (instead of $\nu \otimes \mu$, as done before) to denote the product measure:

$$\int_{X \times Y} \varphi\, d[\mu \otimes \nu] = \int_X \left(\int_Y \varphi(x,y)\, d\nu(y) \right) d\mu(x) \qquad \forall \varphi \in C_c(X \times Y).$$

Finally, if $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are vectors, then $a \otimes b$ denotes the $d \times d$-matrix with entries

$$(a \otimes b)_{ij} = a_i b_j \qquad \forall i,j = 1, \dots, d.$$

The meaning will always be clear from the context.

Here, $\delta_{v=u(t,x)}$ denotes a Dirac mass in v centered on $u(t,x)$. Also, as we shall explain later, at least formally ρ and u should solve the associated limit system given by the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal flocking dissipation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho u) = 0, \\ &\partial_t (\rho u) + \nabla \cdot (\rho u \otimes u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)(u(t,y)-u(t,x))\, dy, \\ &\rho|_{t=0} = \rho_0, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0, \quad \|\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

The main difficulty in the justification of this limit comes from the singularity of the mono-kinetic distribution. To the best of our knowledge, there is no general method to handle the hydrodynamic limit from some kinetic equations to the pressureless Euler systems, no matter what regime is considered. Indeed, there are few results on this kinds of limit, see [18, 19].

It is worth mentioning that the pressureless Euler system without the nonlocal alignment has been used for the formation of large-scale structures in astrophysics and the aggregation of sticky particles [26, 31].

The macroscopic flocking model (1.4) or its variants have been formally derived under a mono-kinetic ansatz (1.3), and studied in various topics (see for example [7, 13, 14, 11, 27]). In [13], the authors have shown the global well-posedness of (1.4) with a suitably smooth and small initial data, and the time-asymptotic flocking behavior. In [14], the authors dealt with a moving boundary problem of (1.4) with compactly supported initial density. We also refer to [11] on a reformulation of (1.4) into hyperbolic conservation laws with damping in one dimension.

In [22], the author have shown the hydrodynamic limit of the kinetic flocking model (1.1) with Brownian motion, that is, Vlasov-Fokker-Planck type equation, under the regime of strong local alignment and strong Brownian motion:

$$\partial_t f^\varepsilon + v \cdot \nabla_x f^\varepsilon + \nabla_v \cdot (L[f^\varepsilon] f^\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_v \cdot ((u^\varepsilon - v) f^\varepsilon) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Delta_v f^\varepsilon = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

In this case, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, f^ε converges to a smooth local equilibrium given by a local Maxwellian, contrary to (1.3). There, the authors used the relative entropy method, heavily relying on a strict convexity of the entropy of the isothermal Euler system, as a limit system of (1.5). The relative entropy method based on a strict convex entropy has been successfully used to prove the hydrodynamic limit of Vlasov-Fokker-Planck type equations, we refer to [3, 10, 23, 28].

On the other hand, the pressureless Euler system (1.4) has a convex entropy given by

$$\eta(\rho, \rho u) = \rho \frac{|u|^2}{2}, \tag{1.6}$$

which is not strictly convex with respect to ρ. For this reason, the associated relative entropy (1.6) is not enough to control the convergence of the nonlocal alignment term (compare with [19], where the nonlocal alignment is not present). To overcome this difficulty, we first estimate a L^2-distance of characteristics generated by vector fields u^ε and u, that controls the 2-Wasserstein distance of densities, and then combine the estimates of the relative entropy and the L^2-distance of characteristics.

As a related work on (1.5), we refer to [3], where the authors studied the flocking behavior and hydrodynamic limit of a coupled system of (1.5) and fluid equations via drag force.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we mention different scales of Cucker-Smale models from microscopic level to macroscopic level, and then specify some known existence results on the two descriptions (1.1) and (1.4). In Section 3, we present our main theorem on the hydrodynamic limit, and collect some useful results on the relative entropy method and the optimal transportation theory that are used in the proof of the main theorem in Section 4. In the Appendix, we provide the proof of the long time-asymptotic flocking dynamics for the kinetic model (1.1).

2. Various scales of Cucker-Smale models

In this section we first present various scales of Cucker-Smale models, from microscopic level to macroscopic level. Then we state some known results on global existence of weak solutions to the kinetic description (1.1), and local existence of smooth solutions to the limit system (1.4). Those results are crucially used in the proof of the main theorem. Finally, in Theorem 2.1, we present the time-asymptotic flocking behavior of the kinetic model (1.1).

2.1. **Variants of Cucker-Smale models.**

In this subsection, we briefly present the kinetic CS model and its variants. Cucker and Smale in [6] proposed a mathematical model to explain the flocking phenomenon:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{dx_i}{dt} = v_i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \\ &\frac{dv_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \psi(x_j - x_i)(v_j - v_i), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $x_i, v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the spatial position and velocity of the i-th particle for an ensemble of N self-propelled particles. The kernel $\psi(|x_j - x_i|)$ is a communication weight given by

$$\psi(x_j - x_i) = \frac{\lambda}{(1 + |x_j - x_i|^2)^\beta}, \quad \beta \geq 0,\ \lambda > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

The system (2.1) with (2.2) was used as an analytical description of the Vicsek model [29] without resorting to the first principle of physics.

When the number of particles is sufficiently large, the ensemble of particles can be described by the one-particle density function $f = f(t, x, v)$ at the spatial-velocity position $(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ at time t. Then, the evolution of f is governed by the following Vlasov type equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v \cdot \nabla_x f + \nabla_v \cdot (F[f]f) = 0, \\ &L[f](t, x, v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x - y) f(t, y, w)(w - v)\, dw\, dy. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

This was first introduced by Ha and Tadmor [17] using the BBGKY Hierarchy from the particle CS model (2.1). A rigorous mean-field limit was given in [16].

In [24], Motsch and Tadmor recognized a drawback of the CS model (2.1), which is due to the normalization factor $\frac{1}{N}$. More precisely, when a small group of agents are located far away from a much larger group of agents, the internal dynamics of the small group is almost halted since the total number of agents is relatively very large. To solve this issue, they

replaced the nonlocal alignment $L[f]$ by a normalized non-symmetric alignment operator:

$$\overline{L}[f](t,x,v) := \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} K^r(x-y)f(t,y,w)(w-v)\,dw\,dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} K^r(x-y)f(t,y,w)\,dw\,dy},$$

where the kernel K^r is a communication weight and r denotes the radius of influence of K^r. In [21], the authors considered the case when the communication weight is extremely concentrated nearby each agent, so that the alignment term $\overline{L}[f]$ corresponds to a short-range interaction. More precisely, they rigorously justified the singular limit $r \to 0$, i.e., as K^r converges to the Dirac distribution δ_0, in which case $\overline{L}[f]$ converge to a local alignment term:

$$\overline{L}[f](t,x,v) \to \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t,x,w)(w-v)\,dw}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t,x,w)\,dw} = u(t,x) - v,$$

where $u(t,x)$ denotes the averaged local velocity defined as $u(t,x) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} vf(t,x,v)dv}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t,x,v)dv}$. Hence, their new model became (1.1), which consists of two kinds of alignment force: a nonlocal alignment due to the original CS model, plus a local alignment.

2.2. **Existence of weak solutions to** (1.2)**.** In [20], the authors showed the existence of weak solutions to the kinetic Cucker-Smale model with local alignment, noise, self-propulsion, and friction:

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t f + v\cdot\nabla_x f + \nabla_v\cdot(L[f]f) + \nabla_v\cdot((u-v)f) \\ &\qquad = \sigma\Delta_v f - \nabla_v\cdot((a-b|v|^2)vf), \\ &L[f] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)f(t,y,w)(w-v)\,dw\,dy, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where the kernel ψ is the same as (1.2) and a, b, and σ are nonnegative constants. By their result applied with $a = b = \sigma = 0$ inside the periodic domain $\mathbb{T}^d$, we obtain existence of solutions for (1.2). To precisely state such existence result, we need to define a (mathematical) entropy $\mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon)$ and kinetic dissipations $\mathcal{D}_1(f^\varepsilon)$, $\mathcal{D}_2(f^\varepsilon)$ for (1.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|v|^2}{2} f^\varepsilon dv, \\ \mathcal{D}_1(f^\varepsilon) &:= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - v|^2\,dv\,dx, \\ \mathcal{D}_2(f^\varepsilon) &:= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)f^\varepsilon(x,v)f^\varepsilon(y,w)|v-w|^2\,dx\,dy\,dv\,dw. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, assume that f_0^ε satisfies*

$$f_0^\varepsilon \geq 0, \quad f_0^\varepsilon \in L^1\cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2d}), \quad |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}). \tag{2.5}$$

Then there exists a weak solution $f^\varepsilon \geq 0$ of (1.2) *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &f^\varepsilon \in C(0,T;L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d}))\cap L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}), \\ &|v|^2 f^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})), \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

and (1.2) *holds in the sense of distribution, that is, for any* $\varphi \in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{2d})$*, the weak formulation holds*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f^\varepsilon \Big(\partial_t\varphi + v\cdot\nabla_x\varphi + L[f^\varepsilon]\cdot\nabla_v\varphi + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(u^\varepsilon - v)\cdot\nabla_v\varphi\Big)\,dv\,dx\,ds \\ + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} f_0^\varepsilon\varphi(0,\cdot)\,dv\,dx = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, f^ε *preserves the total mass and satisfies the entropy inequality*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon)(t)\,dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t \mathcal{D}_1(f^\varepsilon)(s)\,ds + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_2(f^\varepsilon)(s)\,ds \le \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{F}(f_0^\varepsilon)\,dx. \tag{2.8}$$

The entropy inequality (2.8) is crucially used in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

2.3. **Flocking behavior of the kinetic model** (1.1)**.** We now present the time-asymptotic flocking behavior of solutions to the kinetic model (1.1). For that, we define the following two Lyapunov functionals:

$$\mathcal{E}_1(t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f(t,x,v)|u(t,x)-v|^2\,dv\,dx,$$
$$\mathcal{E}_2(t) := \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)|u(t,x)-u(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy,$$

where $\rho(t,x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(t,x,v)dv$. We remark that $\mathcal{E}_1$ measures a local alignment, and $\mathcal{E}_2$ measures alignment of the averaged local velocities. Then, for the flocking estimate, we combine the two functionals as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}(t) := \mathcal{E}_1(t) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_2(t). \tag{2.9}$$

Theorem 2.1. *Let* f *be a solution to* (1.1)*. Then, we have the time-asymptotic flocking estimates:*

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \le \mathcal{E}(0)\exp\Big(-2\min\{1,\psi_m\}t\Big), \quad t>0,$$

where ψ_m *is the minimum communication weight:*

$$\psi_m := \min_{x,y\in\mathbb{T}^d}\psi(x-y) > 0.$$

Proof. We postpone the proof to the Appendix. □

2.4. **Formal derivation of the hydrodynamic Cucker-Smale system** (1.4)**.** We consider the hydrodynamic variables $\rho^\varepsilon := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon dv$ and $\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^\varepsilon dv$.
First of all, integrating (1.2) w.r.t. v, we get the continuity equation $\partial_t\rho^\varepsilon + \nabla_x\cdot(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) = 0$. Multiplying (1.2) by v, and then integrating it w.r.t. v, we have

$$\partial_t(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) + \nabla_x\cdot\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v\otimes v f^\varepsilon dv\Big) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)(u^\varepsilon(t,y)-u^\varepsilon(t,x))\,dy,$$

where we used $u^\varepsilon = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^\varepsilon dv}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon dv}$.
Then, we rewrite the system for ρ^ε and u^ε as

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\rho^\varepsilon + \nabla_x\cdot(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) = 0,\\ &\partial_t(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon) + \nabla_x\cdot(\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon\otimes u^\varepsilon + P^\varepsilon) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)(u^\varepsilon(t,y)-u^\varepsilon(t,x))\,dy,\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where P^ε is the stress tensor given by

$$P^\varepsilon := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v-u^\varepsilon)\otimes(v-u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon dv.$$

If we take $\varepsilon \to 0$ in (1.2), the local alignment term $\nabla_v \cdot ((u^\varepsilon - v) f^\varepsilon)$ converges to 0. Hence, if $\rho^\varepsilon \to \rho$ and $\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon \to \rho u$ for some limiting functions ρ and u, we have that $f^\varepsilon \to \delta_{v=u}\otimes\rho$ (in some suitable sense). Hence, the stress tensor P^ε should vanish in the limit, since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v-u)\otimes(v-u)\delta_{v=u}\rho\, dv = 0.$$

Therefore, at least formally, the limit quantities ρ and u satisfy the pressureless Euler system with nonlocal alignment:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t \rho + \nabla_x\cdot(\rho u) = 0,\\
&\partial_t(\rho u) + \nabla_x\cdot(\rho u\otimes u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)(u(t,y)-u(t,x))\, dy.
\end{aligned}$$

2.5. **Existence of classical solutions to** (1.4)**.** We present here the local existence of classical solutions to the pressureless Euler system (1.4).

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that*

$$\rho_0 > 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^d \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho_0,u_0)\in H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)\times H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^d) \quad \text{for } s > \frac{d}{2}+1. \tag{2.11}$$

Then, there exists $T_*>0$ such that (1.4) *has a unique classical solution (ρ,u) satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho \in C^0([0,T_*];H^s(\mathbb{T}^d))\cap C^1([0,T_*];H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)),\\
&u \in C^0([0,T_*];H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^d))\cap C^1([0,T_*];H^{s}(\mathbb{T}^d)).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Remark 2.1. *Since $s > \frac{d}{2}+1$, by Sobolev inequality it follows that $(\rho,u)\in \mathcal{C}^1([0,T_*]\times\mathbb{T}^d)$.*

Proposition 2.2 has been proven in [13]. There, the authors obtained also a global well-posedness of classical solutions, provided the initial data is suitably smooth and small.

3. Main result and Preliminaries

In this section, we first present our main result on the hydrodynamic limit of (1.2). We next present useful results on the relative entropy method and the optimal transportation theory, which are used as main tools in the next section.

3.1. **Main result.** For the hydrodynamic limit, we consider a well-prepared initial data f_0^ε satisfying (2.5) and

- $(\mathcal{A}1)$: $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(f_0^\varepsilon \frac{|v|^2}{2} - \rho_0\frac{|u_0|^2}{2}\right)dv\,dx = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$,
- $(\mathcal{A}2)$: $\|\rho_0^\varepsilon - \rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$,
- $(\mathcal{A}3)$: $\|u_0^\varepsilon - u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

We now specify our main result on the hydrodynamic limit.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that the initial data f_0^ε and (ρ_0, u_0) satisfy (2.5), (2.11), and (A1)-(A3). Let f^ε be a weak solution to (1.2) satisfying (2.8), and (ρ, u) be a local-in-time smooth solution to (1.4) satisfying (2.12) up to the time T_*. Then, there exists a constant $C(T_*)$ such that, for all $t \le T_*$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(t)|(u^\varepsilon - u)|^2(t)\,dx + W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t), \rho(t))\\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)|(u^\varepsilon(t,x) - u(t,x)) - (u^\varepsilon(t,y) - u(t,y))|^2\,dy\,dx\,ds\\ &\qquad \le C(T_*)\varepsilon,\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where $\rho^\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f^\varepsilon dv$, $\rho^\varepsilon u^\varepsilon = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v f^\varepsilon dv$, and W_2 denotes the 2-Wasserstein distance. Therefore, we have

$$f^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \delta_{v=u(t,x)} \otimes \rho(t,x) \qquad \text{in } L^1_{loc}(0, T_*; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)), \tag{3.14}$$

where $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ is the space of nonnegative Radon measures on $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

The proof of this result is postponed to Section 4. In the next subsections we collect some preliminary facts that will be used later in the proof.

3.2. **Relative entropy method.** First of all, we rewrite the limit system (1.4) in an abstract form using the notation

$$\begin{aligned}&P = \rho u, \quad U = \begin{pmatrix}\rho\\ P\end{pmatrix}, \quad A(U) = \begin{pmatrix}P^T\\ \frac{P\otimes P}{\rho}\end{pmatrix},\\ &F(U) = \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)(u(t,y) - u(t,x))\,dy\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we can rewrite (1.4) as the balance law

$$\partial_t U + \mathrm{div}_x A(U) = F(U). \tag{3.15}$$

We consider the relative entropy and relative flux:

$$\begin{aligned}&\eta(V|U) = \eta(V) - \eta(U) - D\eta(U)\cdot(V-U),\\ &A(V|U) = A(V) - A(U) - DA(U)\cdot(V-U),\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where $DA(U)\cdot(V-U)$ is a matrix defined as

$$(DA(U)\cdot(V-U))_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} \partial_{U_k} A_{ij}(U)(V_k - U_k), \quad 1 \le i \le d+1, \quad 1 \le j \le d.$$

By the theory of conservation laws, the system (3.15) has a convex entropy $\eta(U) = \rho\frac{|u|^2}{2}$ with entropy flux G given by the identity:

$$\partial_{U_i} G_j(U) = \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} \partial_{U_k}\eta(U)\partial_{U_i} A_{kj}(U), \quad 1 \le i \le d+1, \quad 1 \le j \le d.$$

Since $\eta(U) = \frac{|P|^2}{2\rho}$, and

$$D\eta(U) = \begin{pmatrix} D_\rho \eta \\ D_P \eta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{|P|^2}{2\rho^2} \\ \frac{P}{\rho} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{|u|^2}{2} \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.17}$$

for given $V = \binom{q}{qw}$, $U = \binom{\rho}{\rho u}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(V|U) &= \frac{q}{2}|w|^2 - \frac{\rho}{2}|u|^2 + \frac{|u|^2}{2}(q-\rho) - u(qw - \rho u) \\ &= \frac{q}{2}|u-w|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

The next proposition provides a relative entropy inequality for the limiting system (3.15), which was proved in [22].

Proposition 3.1. *Let U be a smooth solution of (3.15) and $V := \begin{pmatrix} q \\ qw \end{pmatrix}$ be any smooth function. Then, the following equality holds:*

(3.19)

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \eta(V|U)\,dx + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)q(t,x)q(t,y)|(w(t,x)-u(t,x)) - (w(t,y)-u(t,y))|^2\,dx\,dy \\ &\quad = \frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \eta(V)\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla_x D\eta(U) : A(V|U)\,dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} D\eta(U)\cdot[\partial_t V + \mathrm{div}_x A(V) - F(V)]\,dx \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)q(t,x)q(t,y)|w(t,x)-w(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy \\ &\qquad - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)q(t,x)(\rho(t,y)-q(t,y))(u(t,y)-u(t,x))(w(t,x)-u(t,x))\,dx\,dy. \end{aligned}$$

3.3. **Wasserstein distance and representation formulae for solutions of the continuity equation.** We consider here the 2-Wasserstein distance (or transportation distance with quadratic cost) between two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on $\mathbb{R}^d$, that is defined by

$$W_2(\mu_1,\mu_2) := \sqrt{\inf_{\nu\in\Lambda(\mu_1,\mu_2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |x-y|^2\,d\nu(x,y)},$$

where $\Lambda(\mu_1,\mu_2)$ denotes the set of all probability measures ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with marginals μ_1 and μ_2, i.e,

$$\pi_{1\#}\nu = \mu_1, \quad \pi_{2\#}\nu = \mu_2,$$

where $\pi_1 : (x,y) \mapsto x$ and $\pi_2 : (x,y) \mapsto y$ are the natural projections from $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\pi_{\#}\nu$ denotes the push forward of ν through a map π. This same definition can be extended to measures on the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ with the understanding that $|x-y|$ denotes the distance on the torus.

To make a connection between the L^2-distance of velocities and the 2-Wasserstein distance of densities (see Lemma 4.4), we will use two different representation formulas for solutions to the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \mu_t + \mathrm{div}_x(u_t \mu_t) = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

Let us recall that, if the velocity field $u_t : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is Lipschitz w.r.t. x, uniformly in t, then for any x there exists a global-in-time unique characteristic X generated by u_t starting from x,

$$\dot{X}(t,x) = u_t(X(t,x)), \quad X(0,x) = x,$$

and the solution μ_t of (3.20) is the push forward of the initial data μ_0 through $X(t)$, i.e.,

$$\mu_t = X(t)_\# \mu_0 \tag{3.21}$$

(e.g., see [1, Proposition 8.1.8]). On the other hand, if the velocity field u_t is not Lipschitz w.r.t. x, the uniqueness of the characteristics is not guaranteed anymore. Still, a probabilistic representation formula for solutions to (3.20) holds:

Proposition 3.2. *For a given $T > 0$, let $\mu_t : [0,T] \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a narrowly continuous solution of (3.20) for a Borel vector field u_t satisfying*

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |u_t(x)|^p d\mu_t(x) dt < \infty, \quad \text{for some } p > 1.$$

Let Γ_T denote the space of continuous curves from $[0,T]$ into $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, there exists a probability measure η on $\Gamma_T \times \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the following properties:
(i) η is concentrated on the set of pairs (γ, x) such that γ is an absolutely continuous curve solving the ODE

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = u_t(\gamma(t)), \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0,T), \text{ with } \gamma(0) = x;$$

(ii) μ_t satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) d\mu_t(x) = \int_{\Gamma_T \times \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(\gamma(t)) d\eta(\gamma, x), \quad \forall \varphi \in C_b^0(\mathbb{R}^d), \ t \in [0,T].$$

Again, this result readily extends on the torus.

Note that, in the case when u_t is Lipschitz, there exists a unique curve γ solving the ODE and starting from x (i.e., $\gamma = X(\cdot, x)$), so the measure η is given by the formula

$$d\eta(\gamma, x) = \delta_{\gamma = X(\cdot,x)} \otimes d\mu_0(x).$$

We refer to [1, Theorem 8.2.1] for more details and a proof.

4. Proof of Theorem 3.1

The main part of the proof consists in obtaining the estimate (3.13). This will be done by combining two kinds of bounds based on the relative entropy method and optimal transportation theory. We first derive some estimates from the relative entropy method.

4.1. Estimates on the relative entropy.

For the weak solution f^ε to (1.2), it follows from (2.10) that $U^\varepsilon = \binom{\rho^\varepsilon}{P^\varepsilon}$ solves the system:

$$\partial_t U^\varepsilon + \mathrm{div}_x A(U^\varepsilon) = F(U^\varepsilon) + \mathrm{div}_x \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v - u^\varepsilon) \otimes (v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon dv \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.22}$$

where the equality holds in the sense of distributions (see (2.7)). Our goal is to use (3.19) to measure a distance between solutions of (3.15) and (4.22).

Before applying (3.19) to the case of $V = U^\varepsilon$, it is useful to replace the nonlocal dissipation $\mathcal{D}_2$ in the kinetic entropy inequality (2.8) by another dissipation $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2$ defined in terms of the hydrodynamic variables ρ^ε and u^ε.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, assume that f_0^ε satisfies*

$$f_0^\varepsilon \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d), \quad |v|^2 f_0^\varepsilon \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

Then the weak solution f^ε in Proposition 2.1 also satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon)(t)\,dx + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\int_0^t \mathcal{D}_1(f^\varepsilon)(s)\,ds + \int_0^t \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2(f^\varepsilon)(s)\,ds \le \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{F}(f_0^\varepsilon)\,dx, \tag{4.23}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2(f^\varepsilon) := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)|u^\varepsilon(t,x) - u^\varepsilon(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy.$$

Proof. Recalling (2.8), it is enough to show $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2(f^\varepsilon) \le \mathcal{D}_2(f^\varepsilon)$. We first rewrite $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2(f^\varepsilon)$ in terms of the mesoscopic variables as follows: using $\psi(x-y) = \psi(y-x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_2(f^\varepsilon) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)(v-w)\cdot(u^\varepsilon(t,x) - u^\varepsilon(t,y))\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)(v-w)\cdot u^\varepsilon(t,x)\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy \\
&= \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)(v-w)\cdot v\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy}_{=:\mathcal{I}_1} \\
&\quad \underbrace{+\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)(v-w)\cdot(u^\varepsilon(t,x) - v)\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy}_{=:\mathcal{I}_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

First, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)|v-w|^2\,dx\,dy\,dv\,dw = \mathcal{D}_2(f^\varepsilon).$$

We next claim $\mathcal{I}_2 \le 0$.
Indeed, since

$$\rho^\varepsilon|u^\varepsilon|^2 = \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v f^\varepsilon dv\right)^2}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon dv} \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v|^2 f^\varepsilon dv, \tag{4.24}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w)|v|^2\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy \\
&\qquad\qquad \ge \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)|u^\varepsilon(t,x)|^2\,dx\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w) u^\varepsilon(t,x)\cdot w\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy \\
&\qquad\qquad = \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y) u^\varepsilon(t,x)\cdot u^\varepsilon(t,y)\,dx\,dy,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w) u^\varepsilon(t,x)\cdot v \, dv\, dw\, dx\, dy$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)|u^\varepsilon(t,x)|^2 \, dx\, dy,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y) f^\varepsilon(t,x,v) f^\varepsilon(t,y,w) v\cdot w \, dv\, dw\, dx\, dy$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y) u^\varepsilon(t,x)\cdot u^\varepsilon(t,y) \, dx\, dy,$$

we conclude that $\mathcal{I}_2 \le 0$, as desired. □

We now use Proposition 3.1 together with Lemma 4.1 to estimate the relative entropy of the weak solution U^ε and the smooth solution U.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that the initial data U_0^ε and U_0 satisfy* (2.5), (2.11), *and* ($\mathcal{A}$1)-($\mathcal{A}$3). *Let U^ε be a weak solution of* (3.15) *satisfying* (4.23), *and U the classical solution of* (4.22). *Then, for all $t \le T_*$,*

(4.25)
$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(t)\frac{|u^\varepsilon-u|^2(t)}{2}\,dx$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)\rho^\varepsilon(s,y)|(u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x))-(u^\varepsilon(s,y)-u(s,y))|^2\,dy\,dx\,ds$$
$$\le \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) + C\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho^\varepsilon(s)|u^\varepsilon-u|^2(s)\,dx\,ds$$
$$-\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)(\rho(s,y)-\rho^\varepsilon(s,y))(u(s,y)-u(s,x))(u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x))\,dx\,dy\,ds.$$

Proof. First of all, it follows from (3.19) that

(4.26)
$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\eta(U^\varepsilon|U)(t)\,dx$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)|(u^\varepsilon(t,x)-u(t,x))-(u^\varepsilon(t,y)-u(t,y))|^2\,dy\,dx\,ds$$
$$\le \mathcal{I}_1+\mathcal{I}_2+\mathcal{I}_3+\mathcal{I}_4+\mathcal{I}_5+\mathcal{I}_6,$$
$$\mathcal{I}_1 := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\eta(U_0^\varepsilon|U_0)\,dx, \quad \mathcal{I}_2 := \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}(\eta(U^\varepsilon)(t)-\eta(U_0^\varepsilon))\,dx,$$
$$\mathcal{I}_3 := \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}}\psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)\rho^\varepsilon(s,y)|u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u^\varepsilon(s,y)|^2\,dx\,dy\,ds,$$
$$\mathcal{I}_4 := -\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x D\eta(U) : A(U^\varepsilon|U)\,dx\,ds,$$
$$\mathcal{I}_5 := -\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} D\eta(U)[\partial_t U^\varepsilon + \mathrm{div}_x A(U^\varepsilon) - F(U^\varepsilon)]\,dx\,ds,$$
$$\mathcal{I}_6 := \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}}\psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)(\rho^\varepsilon(s,y)-\rho(s,y))(u(s,y)-u(s,x))(u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x))\,dx\,dy\,ds.$$

We use (3.18) and assumption $(\mathcal{A}3)$ to get

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho_0^\varepsilon |u_0^\varepsilon - u_0|^2 dx \le C\varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_0^\varepsilon \, dx \le C\varepsilon^2.$$

We rewrite $\mathcal{I}_2$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\eta(U^\varepsilon)(t) - \mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon)(t))\, dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon)(t) - \mathcal{F}(f_0^\varepsilon))\, dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mathcal{F}(f_0^\varepsilon) - \eta(U_0))\, dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\eta(U_0) - \eta(U_0^\varepsilon))\, dx := \sum_{k=1}^4 \mathcal{I}_2^k.\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

Thanks to (4.24), we have the minimization property

$$\eta(U^\varepsilon) \le \mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon), \tag{4.28}$$

which yields $\mathcal{I}_2^1 \le 0$.
The entropy inequality (4.23) implies that

$$\mathcal{I}_2^2 + \mathcal{I}_3 \le 0.$$

Also, it follows from $(\mathcal{A}1)$ that $\mathcal{I}_2^3 = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.
Then, we use assumptions $(\mathcal{A}2)$ and $(\mathcal{A}3)$ to get

$$\mathcal{I}_2^4 = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\rho_0 |u_0|^2 - \rho_0^\varepsilon |u_0^\varepsilon|^2\right) \le \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\rho_0 - \rho_0^\varepsilon||u_0|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_0^\varepsilon \left||u_0^\varepsilon|^2 - |u_0|^2\right| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

For $\mathcal{I}_4$, we first compute the relative flux as follows: since

$$A(U^\varepsilon|U) = A(U^\varepsilon) - A(U) - DA(U)\cdot(U^\varepsilon - U),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}DA(U)\cdot(U^\varepsilon - U) &= D_\rho A(U)(\rho^\varepsilon - \rho) + D_{P_i} A(U)(P_i^\varepsilon - P_i) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (P^\varepsilon - P)^T \\ -\frac{\rho^\varepsilon - \rho}{\rho^2} P\otimes P + \frac{1}{\rho} P\otimes(P^\varepsilon - P) + \frac{1}{\rho}(P^\varepsilon - P)\otimes P \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}A(U^\varepsilon|U) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{\rho^\varepsilon} P^\varepsilon\otimes P^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\rho} P\otimes P + \frac{\rho^\varepsilon - \rho}{\rho^2} P\otimes P - \frac{1}{\rho} P\otimes(P^\varepsilon - P) - \frac{1}{\rho}(P^\varepsilon - P)\otimes P \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon - u)\otimes(u^\varepsilon - u) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (3.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_4 &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^\varepsilon (u^\varepsilon - u)\otimes(u^\varepsilon - u) : \nabla_x u \, dx\, ds \\ &\le C\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^\infty((0,T_*)\times\mathbb{T}^d)} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho^\varepsilon |u^\varepsilon - u|^2 \, dx\, ds \\ &= C\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^\infty((0,T_*)\times\mathbb{T}^d)} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \eta(U^\varepsilon|U)\, dx\, ds.\end{aligned}$$

For $\mathcal{I}_5$, it follows from (4.22) that

$$\mathcal{I}_5 = -\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla_x D_P \mathcal{E}(U) : \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (v - u^\varepsilon)\otimes(v - u^\varepsilon) f^\varepsilon dv\Big)\, dx\, ds.$$

Since it follows from (2.8) and $(\mathcal{A}1)$ that

$$\int_0^{T_*} \mathcal{D}_1(f^\varepsilon)\,ds \le C\varepsilon, \tag{4.29}$$

we have

$$\mathcal{I}_6 \le \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\nabla_x D\eta(U)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v-u^\varepsilon|^2 f^\varepsilon dv\,dx\,ds \\ \le C\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^\infty((0,T_*)\times\mathbb{T}^d)} \int_0^{T_*} \mathcal{D}_1(f^\varepsilon)\,ds \le C\varepsilon.$$

Therefore, this proves (4.25). □

4.2. **Estimates on the 2-Wasserstein distance.** Based on the estimates (4.25), our next step is to control some suitable distance between ρ^ε and ρ, so that the last integral in the right hand side of (4.25) can be controlled by the relative entropy. For that, we shall use the 2-Wasserstein distance. We first derive some estimates for the characteristics generated by the velocity fields u^ε and u.

For the velocity u in the limit system (1.4), let X be a characteristic generated by it, that is

$$\dot X(t,x) = u(t,X(t,x)), \quad X(0,x) = x. \tag{4.30}$$

Then, thanks to the smoothness of u, it follows from (3.21) that

$$X(t)_\# \rho_0(x)\,dx = \rho(t,x)\,dx.$$

On the other hand, since u^ε is not Lipschitz w.r.t x, we use a probabilistic representation for ρ^ε as a solution of the continuity equation in (3.15). More precisely, (4.28) and (2.8) imply

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |u^\varepsilon(t)|^2 \rho^\varepsilon(t)\,dx \le \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{F}(f^\varepsilon)(t)\,dx \le \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \mathcal{F}(f_0^\varepsilon)\,dx < \infty,$$

so it follows from Proposition 3.2 that there exists a probability measure η^ε in $\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d$ that is concentrated on the set of pairs (γ,x) such that γ is a solution of the ODE

$$\dot\gamma(t) = u^\varepsilon(\gamma(t)), \quad \gamma(0) = x, \tag{4.31}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi(x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx = \int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi(\gamma(t))\,d\eta^\varepsilon(\gamma,x), \quad \forall \varphi\in C^0(\mathbb{T}^d),\ t\in[0,T_*]. \tag{4.32}$$

In particular, this says that the time marginal of the measure η^ε at time 0 is given by $\rho^\varepsilon(0) = \rho_0^\varepsilon$. Hence, by the disintegration theorem of measures, we can write

$$d\eta^\varepsilon(\gamma,x) = \eta_x^\varepsilon(d\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx,$$

where $\{\eta_x^\varepsilon\}_{x\in\mathbb{T}^d}$ is a family of probability measures on Γ_{T^*} concentrated on solutions of (4.31).

For the flow X in (4.30), we also consider the densities $\widetilde\rho^\varepsilon(t)$ defined as

$$\widetilde\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx = X(t)_\#\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx. \tag{4.33}$$

Note that, since

$$\|\rho(t)-\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \sup_{\|\varphi\|_\infty\le 1}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\varphi(x)[\rho(t,x)-\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t,x)]\,dx$$
$$= \sup_{\|\varphi\|_\infty\le 1}\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\varphi(X(t,x))[\rho_0(x)-\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)]\,dx \le \|\rho_0^\varepsilon-\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

we have

$$\|\rho(t)-\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \le \|\rho_0^\varepsilon-\rho_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}. \tag{4.34}$$

We now consider the measure ν^ε on $\Gamma_{T_*}\times\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d$ defined as

$$d\nu^\varepsilon(\gamma,\sigma,x) = \eta_x^\varepsilon(d\gamma)\otimes\delta_{X(\cdot,x)}(d\sigma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx.$$

If we consider the evaluation map

$$E_t:\Gamma_{T_*}\times\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d\to\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{T}^d,\qquad E_t(\gamma,\sigma,x)=(\gamma(t),\sigma(t)),$$

it follows that the measure $\pi_t^\varepsilon := (E_t)_\#\nu^\varepsilon$ on $\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{T}^d$ has marginals $\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx$ and $\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t,y)\,dy$ for all $t\ge 0$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2\eta_x^\varepsilon(d\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx &= \int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-\sigma(t)|^2 d\nu^\varepsilon(\gamma,\sigma,x)\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}}|x-y|^2 d\pi_t^\varepsilon(x,y)\\ &\ge W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t),\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t)).\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

We shall also need the following standard result, that we include for the convenience of the reader:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\rho_1,\rho_2:\mathbb{T}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ be two probability densities. Then*

$$W_2^2(\rho_1,\rho_2)\le\frac{d}{8}\|\rho_1-\rho_2\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)}.$$

Proof. The idea is simple: to estimate the transportation cost from ρ_1 to ρ_2 it suffices to consider a transport plan that keeps at rest all the mass in common between ρ_1 and ρ_2 (namely $\min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}$) and sends $\rho_1-\min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}$ onto $\rho_2-\min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}$ in an arbitrary way. For instance, assuming without loss of generality that $\rho_1\neq\rho_2$ (otherwise the result is trivial), we set

$$m := \|\rho_1-\min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \|\rho_2-\min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \frac{1}{2}\|\rho_1-\rho_2\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} > 0.$$

Then, a possible choice of transport plan between ρ_1 and ρ_2 is given by

$$\pi(dx,dy) := \delta_{x=y}(dy)\otimes\min\{\rho_1(x),\rho_2(x)\}dx$$
$$+\frac{1}{m}[\rho_1(x)-\min\{\rho_1(x),\rho_2(x)\}]dx\otimes[\rho_2(y)-\min\{\rho_1(y),\rho_2(y)\}]dy.$$

Since the diameter of $\mathbb{T}^d$ is bounded by $\sqrt{d}/2$, we deduce that the W_2^2-cost to transport $\rho_1 - \min\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ onto $\rho_2 - \min\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} |x-y|^2 d\pi(x,y) &\\ = \frac{1}{m}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} |x-y|^2 (\rho_1(x) - \min\{\rho_1(x),\rho_2(x)\})(\rho_2(y) - \min\{\rho_1(y),\rho_2(y)\})\,dx\,dy &\\ \le \frac{d}{4}\,\|\rho_1 - \min\{\rho_1,\rho_2\}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = \frac{d}{8}\,\|\rho_1-\rho_2\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)},&\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

We now use the above results to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 4.2, we have that*

$$W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t),\rho(t)) \le Ce^{T_*}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x)|^2\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)\,dx\,ds + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \qquad t\le T_*. \tag{4.36}$$

Proof. Let $\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon$ be defined as (4.33). We begin by observing that, thanks to Lemma 4.3, (4.34), and assumption ($\mathcal{A}2$), it follows that

$$W_2^2(\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t),\rho(t)) \le \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Hence, to prove (4.36), it is enough to bound $W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t),\widetilde{\rho}^\varepsilon(t))$.

To this aim, we try to get a Gronwall-type inequality on

$$\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d} |\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2\eta_x^\varepsilon(d\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx.$$

Since

$$\dot\gamma(t)-\dot X(t,x) = \big(u^\varepsilon(\gamma(t))-u(\gamma(t))\big)+\big(u(\gamma(t))-u(X(t,x))\big),$$

(by (4.30) and (4.31)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx\\ &\le \int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|u^\varepsilon(\gamma(t))-u(\gamma(t))|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx\\ &\quad+\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|u(\gamma(t))-u(X(t,x))|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx\\ &\quad+2\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that, thanks to (4.32),

$$\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|u^\varepsilon(\gamma(t))-u(\gamma(t))|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}|u^\varepsilon(t,x)-u(t,x)|^2\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx.$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|u(\gamma(t))-u(X(t,x))|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx&\\ \le \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_*;W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d))}\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx,&\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx$$
$$\leq C\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx+\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}|u^\varepsilon(t,x)-u(t,x)|^2\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\,dx.$$

Therefore, using Gronwall's inequality together with $\gamma(0)=X(0,x)=x$ for η_x^ε-a.e. γ, we obtain

$$\int_{\Gamma_{T_*}\times\mathbb{T}^d}|\gamma(t)-X(t,x)|^2 d\eta_x^\varepsilon(\gamma)\otimes\rho_0^\varepsilon(x)\,dx$$
$$\leq Ce^{T_*}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}|u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x)|^2\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)\,dx\,ds,\qquad t\leq T_*.$$

Hence, using (4.35) we get the desired control on $W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t),\widetilde{\rho^\varepsilon}(t))$, which concludes the proof. □

4.3. **Combination of the relative entropy and Wasserstein distance.** We now combine the two estimates (4.25) and (4.36) as follows:

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\frac{|u^\varepsilon(t,x)-u(t,x)|^2}{2}dx+W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t),\rho(t))$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}}\psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\rho^\varepsilon(t,y)|(u^\varepsilon(t,x)-u(x))-(u^\varepsilon(t,y)-u(y))|^2\,dy\,dx\,ds$$
$$\leq\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)+C(T_*)\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)|u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x)|^2dx\,ds$$
$$+\int_0^t\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}}\psi(x-y)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)(\rho^\varepsilon(s,y)-\rho(s,y))(u(s,y)-u(s,x))(u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x))\,dy\,dx}_{I}\,ds.$$

To estimate I, we separate it into two parts:

$$I=\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\psi(x-y)u(s,y)(\rho^\varepsilon(s,y)-\rho(s,y))dy\Big)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)(u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x))\,dx$$
$$-\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\psi(x-y)(\rho^\varepsilon(s,y)-\rho(s,y))dy\Big)u(s,x)\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)(u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x))\,dx.$$

Since ψ and u are Lipschitz, we use the Kantorovich-Rubinstein Theorem to estimate

$$I\leq W_1(\rho^\varepsilon(s),\rho(s))\Big(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{T}^d}\|\psi(x-\cdot)u\|_{L^\infty(0,T_*;W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d))}$$
$$+\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(0,T_*;W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d))}\|u\|_{L^\infty((0,T_*)\times\mathbb{T}^d)}\Big)\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)|u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x)|\,dx.$$

Hence, since $W_1(\rho^\varepsilon(s),\rho(s))\leq W_2(\rho^\varepsilon(s),\rho(s))$, we obtain

$$I\leq C\Big(W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(s),\rho(s))+\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho^\varepsilon(s,x)|u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x)|^2dx\Big).$$

Thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(t,x)\frac{|u^\varepsilon(t,x)-u(t,x)|^2}{2}dx + W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(t),\rho(t)) \\ \le \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) + C\int_0^t \Big(\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho^\varepsilon(s,x)|u^\varepsilon(s,x)-u(s,x)|^2dx + W_2^2(\rho^\varepsilon(s),\rho(s))\Big)\,ds.$$

and (3.13) follows by Gronwall's inequality.

4.4. **Proof of** (3.14)**.** Here we use the estimate (3.13) to show the convergence (3.14). First, thanks to (3.13) and (4.29), it follows that for any $0<\tau<t<T_*$,

$$\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon |v-u|^2\,dx\,dv\,ds \le 2\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon(|v-u^\varepsilon|^2+|u^\varepsilon-u|^2)\,dx\,dv\,ds \\ \le C(\varepsilon+T_*\varepsilon) \le C(T_*)\varepsilon. \tag{4.37}$$

Then, for any $\phi\in C_c^1(\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x,v) f^\varepsilon\,dx\,dv\,ds - \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x,v)\rho\,\delta_u(dv)\,dx\,ds\\
&= \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(x,v) f^\varepsilon\,dx\,dv\,ds - \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x,u)\rho\,dx\,ds\\
&= \underbrace{\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon\big(\phi(x,v)-\phi(x,u)\big)\,dx\,dv\,ds}_{=:I_1} + \underbrace{\int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi(x,u)(\rho^\varepsilon-\rho)\,dx\,ds}_{=:I_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (4.37), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\le \|\nabla_v\phi\|_\infty \int_\tau^t \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f^\varepsilon|v-u|\,dx\,dv\,ds\\
&= \|\nabla_v\phi\|_\infty\Big(\int_\tau^t \int_{|v-u|\le\sqrt{\varepsilon}} f^\varepsilon|v-u|\,dx\,dv\,ds + \int_\tau^t \int_{|v-u|>\sqrt{\varepsilon}} f^\varepsilon|v-u|\,dx\,dv\,ds\Big)\\
&\le \|\nabla_v\phi\|_\infty\Big(\sqrt{\varepsilon}T_* + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\int_\tau^t \int_{|v-u|>\sqrt{\varepsilon}} f^\varepsilon|v-u|^2 dv\,dx\,ds\Big)\\
&\le C(T_*)\sqrt{\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $W_1(\rho^\varepsilon,\rho)\le W_2(\rho^\varepsilon,\rho)\to 0$ by (3.13), we also have $I_2\to 0$. Hence, this completes the proof of (3.14).

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 2.1

We first estimate $\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_1$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_1 &= 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} f(u-v)\partial_t u\,dv\,dx + \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \partial_t f|u-v|^2\,dv\,dx\\
&:= I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

First of all, by the definition of u, we have $\int f(u-v)\,dv = 0$, hence $I_1 = 0$. Concerning I_2, it follows from (1.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} |u-v|^2 \Big(-\nabla_x\cdot(vf) - \nabla_v\cdot(L[f]f) - \nabla_v\cdot((u-v)f)\Big)\,dv\,dx \\ &= \underbrace{2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x u(u-v)\cdot v f\,dv\,dx}_{=:I_{21}} \underbrace{-2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} (u-v)\cdot L[f]f\,dv\,dx}_{=:I_{22}} \\ &\quad \underbrace{-2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} |u-v|^2 f\,dv\,dx}_{=-2\mathcal{E}_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we use the stress tensor $P = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(v-u)\otimes(v-u)f\,dv$ to rewrite I_{21} as

$$I_{21} = 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla_x u(u-v)\cdot(v-u)f\,dv\,dx = 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla_x\cdot P\cdot u\,dx.$$

Thanks to the estimate on $\mathcal{I}_2$ in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$I_{22} = -2\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)f(t,x,v)f(t,y,w)(u(t,x)-v)\cdot(w-v)\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy \le 0.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_1 \le 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla_x\cdot P\cdot u\,dx - 2\mathcal{E}_1. \tag{A.38}$$

We next estimate $\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_2 &= 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \partial_t\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)|u(t,x)-u(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy \\ &\quad + 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)(u(t,x)-u(t,y))\partial_t(u(t,x)-u(t,y))\,dx\,dy \\ &:= J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since it follows from (2.10) with $\varepsilon = 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t\rho + \nabla_x\cdot(\rho u) = 0, \\ &\rho\partial_t u + \rho u\cdot\nabla_x u + \nabla_x\cdot P = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L[f]f\,dv, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain (recall that $\|\rho\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= -2\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \nabla_x\cdot(\rho u)(t,x)\rho(t,y)|u(t,x)-u(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy \\ &= 4\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho u\cdot\nabla_x u\cdot u\,dx - 4\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho u\cdot\nabla_x u\,dx\cdot\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho u\,dx, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &= 4\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \rho(t,y)u(t,x)\rho(t,x)\partial_t u(t,x)\,dx\,dy - 4\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \rho(t,y)u(t,y)\rho(t,x)\partial_t u(t,x)\,dx\,dy \\
&= -4\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho u\cdot\nabla_x u\cdot u\,dx - 4\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x\cdot P\cdot u\,dx \\
&\quad + 4\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} u\cdot L[f]f\,dx\,dv}_{:=J_{21}} + 4\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho u\cdot\nabla_x u\,dx\cdot\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho u\,dx \\
&\quad + 4\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x\cdot P dx}_{=0}\cdot\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho u\,dx - 4\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} L[f]f\,dx\,dv}_{:=J_{22}}\cdot\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\rho u\,dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute the above terms J_{21} and J_{22} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{21} &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)f(t,x,v)f(t,y,w)(w-v)\cdot u(t,x)\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)(u(t,y)-u(t,x))\cdot u(t,x)\,dx\,dy \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)|u(t,x)-u(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy, \\
J_{22} &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}\times\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)f(t,x,v)f(t,y,w)(w-v)\,dv\,dw\,dx\,dy = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}_2 = -4\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x\cdot P\cdot u\,dx - 2\int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)|u(t,x)-u(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy.$$

Recalling (A.38), proves that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E} &\le -2\mathcal{E}_1 - \int_{\mathbb{T}^{2d}} \psi(x-y)\rho(t,x)\rho(t,y)|u(t,x)-u(t,y)|^2\,dx\,dy \\
&\le -2\mathcal{E}_1 - \psi_m\mathcal{E}_2 \le -2\min\{1,\psi_m\}\mathcal{E},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

References

1. L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savare, *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in spaces of probability measures, lectures in mathematics eth zurich*, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel (2005).
2. E. Carlen, M. Carvalho, P. Degond, and B. Wennberg, *A Boltzmann model for rod alignment and schooling fish,*, Nonlinearity, 28, 17831803 (2015).
3. J. A. Carrillo, Y.-P. Choi, and T. K. Karper, *On the analysis of a coupled kinetic-fluid model with local alignment forces*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire, 33, 2, 273307 (2016).
4. J. A. Carrillo, M. Fornasier, J. Rosado, and G. Toscani, *Asymptotic flocking dynamics for the kinetic Cucker-Smale model.*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 42, 218–236 (2010).
5. J. A. Cãnizo, J. A. Carrillo, and J. Rosado, *A well-posedness theory in measures for some kinetic models of collective motion*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 21, 515–539 (2011).
6. F. Cucker and S. Smale, *Emergent behavior in flocks*, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control 52, 852-862 (2007).
7. T. Do, A. Kiselev, L. Ryzhik, and C. Tan, *Global regularity for the fractional Euler alignment system,*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.05155,.
8. R. Duan, M. Fornasier, and G. Toscani, *A kinetic flocking model with diffusion*, Commun. Math. Phys. 300, 95-145 (2010).

9. M. Fornasier, J. Haskovec, and G. Toscani, *Fluid dynamic description of flocking via Povzner-Boltzmann equation* ,, Physica D, 240, 21-31, (2011).
10. T. Goudon, P.-E Jabin, and A. Vasseur, *Hydrodynamic limit for the Vlasov-Navier-Stokes equations. ii. fine particles regime,*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 53(6), 15171536, (2004).
11. S.-Y. Ha, F. Huang, and Y. Wang, *A global unique solvability of entropic weak solution to the one-dimensional pressureless Euler system with a flocking dissipation* ,, J. Differential Equations. 257, 1333–1371, (2014).
12. S.-Y. Ha, J. Jeong, S. E. Noh, Q. Xiao, and X. Zhang, *Emergent dynamics of cuckersmale flocking particles in a random environment,*, Journal of Differential Equations 262 (3) 2554–2591, (2017).
13. S.-Y. Ha, M.-J. Kang, and B. Kwon, *A hydrodynamic model for the interaction of Cucker-Smale particles and incompressible fluid*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 11, 2311–2359 (2014).
14. ———, *Emergent dynamics for the hydrodynamic Cucker-Smale system in a moving domain*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 47(5), 3813–3831 (2015).
15. S.-Y. Ha, Z. Li, M. Slemrod, and X. Xue, *Flocking behavior of the cucker-smale model under rooted leadership in a large coupling limit,*, Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, (2014).
16. S.-Y. Ha and J. G. Liu, *A simple proof of the Cucker-Smale flocking dynamics and mean-field limit*, Communications in Mathematical Sciences, 7(2), 297–325 (2009).
17. S.-Y. Ha and E. Tadmor, *From particle to kinetic and hydrodynamic descriptions of flocking*, Kinetic and Related Models, 1(3), 415–435 (2008).
18. P.-E. Jabin and T. Rey, *Hydrodynamic limit of granular gases to pressureless Euler in dimension 1,*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.09103 (2016).
19. M.-J. Kang and A. Vasseur, *Asymptotic analysis of Vlasov-type equations under strong local alignment regime*, Math. Mod. Meth. Appl. Sci., 25(11), 2153–2173 (2015).
20. T. K. Karper, A. Mellet, and K. Trivisa, *Existence of weak solutions to kinetic flocking models*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 45(1), 215 – 243 (2013).
21. ———, *On strong local alignment in the kinetic Cucker-Smale model*, Hyperbolic Conservation Laws and Related Analysis with Applications, Springer Proceedings in Math. Statistics Vol. 49, 227–242 (2014).
22. ———, *Hydrodynamic limit of the kinetic Cucker-Smale flocking model*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. (2015).
23. A. Mellet and A. Vasseur, *Asymptotic analysis for a Vlasov-Fokker-Planck compressible Navier-Stokes systems of equations,*, Commun. Math. Phys. 281, 573–596, (2008).
24. S. Motsch and E. Tadmor, *A new model for self-organized dynamics and its flocking behavior*, Journal of Statistical Physics, Springer, 141 (5): 923–947 (2011).
25. David Poyato and Juan Soler, *Euler-type equations and commutators in singular and hyperbolic limits of kinetic Cucker-Smale models,*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.00743 (2016).
26. J. Silk, A. Szalay, and Ya. B. Zeldovich, *Large-scale structure of the universe* ,, Scientific American, 249, 7280, (1983).
27. E. Tadmor and C. Tan, *Critical thresholds in flocking hydrodynamics with non-local alignment,*, Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London A, 372, 20130401, (2014).
28. A. Vasseur, *Recent results on hydrodynamic limits* ,, In Handbook of differential equations: evolutionary equations. Vol. IV, Handb. Differ. Equ., 323–376. Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, (2008).
29. T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet, *Novel type of phase transition in a system of self-driven particles*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, pp. 1226-1229 (1995).
30. M. Zavlanos, M. Egerstedt, and G. J. Pappas, *Graph theoretic connectivity control of mobile robot networks*, Proceedings of the IEEE, 99(9):1525–1540 (2011).
31. Ya. B. Zeldovich, *Gravitational instability: An approximate theory for large density perturbations*, Astro. Astrophys., 5, 84 (1970).

(Alessio Figalli)
ETH Zürich, Department of Mathematics,
Rämistrasse 101, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland.
E-mail address: alessio.figalli@math.ethz.ch

(Moon-Jin Kang)
The University of Texas at Austin, Dept. of Math. RLM 8.100,
2515 Speedway Stop C1200, Austin TX 78712, USA
E-mail address: moonjinkang@math.utexas.edu